

Appl. No. 09/221,952

REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action of 27 May 2004. Claims 1-10, 12, and 14-21 are pending in the application, and Claims 1-10, 12, and 14-21 have been rejected.

Claims 1, 6, and 19-20 have been amended, and Claims 8-9 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer.

No new matter has been added.

In view of the amendments above and remarks below, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and further examination.

About The Invention

The present invention relates generally to information and resource management, typically in the context of an information apparatus. More particularly, various embodiments of the present invention provide for enhancing coordination between acquisition resources and exploiting resources, via information association resources. Such information association resources may coordinate with acquisition resources so as to reduce the amount of user skill and/or effort consumed in distributing any particular information to any particular exploiting resource.

Drawing Objections

The Examiner has objected to the drawings under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The Examiner states that the drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the Claims, and therefore (i) the "first complexity and second complexity"; (ii) "the pointer"; and (iii) "the status data" must be shown or the features cancelled from the Claims.

Applicants respectfully note that Claim 1 has been amended, in a non-narrowing manner and consistent with the specification, to delete the recitation of

Appl. No. 09/221,952

the "first complexity and second complexity", "status data" and "pointer". In view of this amendment, Applicants respectfully submit that the objection to the drawings based on this language has been overcome.

Claim Objections

Claim 19 has been objected to because of an informality. More particularly, the Examiner states that the limitation "handling of use of both of common and of differing transducing facilities" appears to be a sentence fragment, and has required correction.

Claim 19 has been amended in a non-narrowing manner to correct the typographical and grammatical errors therein. Specifically, an extraneous occurrence of the word "of" has been deleted, and commas have been added to improve readability. Applicants respectfully submit that this amendment overcomes the objection to Claim 19.

Rejections under 35 USC 112, first paragraph

Claims 1, 4, 6, and 14 has been rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement.

With respect to numbered paragraph 8 of the Office Action, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection based on the Examiner's assertion that the limitation "association annotation" is not specifically disclosed in the specification. Association annotation refers to data, or information, provided by the association resources to the distribution resources which direct the distribution resources in distributing acquired information. Discussion and description of "association annotation" is found throughout the lengthy specification. Moreover, it is specifically disclosed that the association annotation is based on at least one of the information acquired by the acquisition resources or directives provided in

Appl. No. 09/221,952

accordance with prevailing configuration of the apparatus (for example, please see page 3, lines 9-13). The specification further discloses a number of specific examples of "association annotations" which are set forth as command scripts (for example, please see page 24, line 15, through page 25, line 26). Applicants submit that there is no ambiguity or lack of clarity with regard to "association annotations" being data, or information, produced by the association resources and provided to the distribution resources for the purpose of directing the operation of the distribution resources.

With respect to numbered paragraph 9 of the Office Action, Claim 1, has been amended to delete the recitation of the "first complexity" and "second complexity". Applicant submits that rejection of numbered paragraph 9 has been overcome.

With respect to numbered paragraph 10 of the Office Action, based on the allegation that the limitation "indirect distribution" is not specifically disclosed in the specification as to what determines or makes the distribution "indirect", Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection and requests that it be withdrawn. Applicant respectfully submits that the specification makes clear what is meant by indirect distribution. The Examiner's attention is directed to page 17, lines 13-28 of the specification, wherein the distinction between direct and indirect distribution is explained. More particularly, the specification makes clear that although the distribution resources may provide acquired data to exploiting resources, there are instances wherein the acquired data is further processed and then set aside for a later distribution process. By way of example, and not limitation, if the information apparatus acquires data that is to be distributed to a remote host which is not connected to the information apparatus, the acquired information may be stored by the staging facility 230 which supports delayed distribution (i.e., distribution when the host is connected to the information apparatus at a later time). Alternatively, the acquired information may be destined for processing by an application program (i.e., an exploiting resource 208B) in the remote host 104 such that the data is incorporated into a database within the host 104, but with the host 104 not connected to the information

Appl. No. 09/221,952

apparatus 200, the acquired data is incorporated into a local (i.e., within the information apparatus 200) copy of the database by an exploiting resource 208A within the information apparatus, along with the posting of associated status and annotation information. Subsequently, when the information apparatus 200 is connected to the remote host 104, a synchronization process may be performed, by which the earlier acquired and locally processed data is communicated to the now connected remote host 104. Such processes, as are described above, are referred to by the Applicants as indirect distributions of data to exploiting resources 208. In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that the specification does disclose what makes the distribution "indirect", and requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

With respect to numbered paragraph 11 of the Office Action, the Examiner states that the recitation of an activation being direct or indirect is not specifically disclosed in the specification. Claim 20 has been amended in a non-narrowing manner to delete both the terms "direct" and "indirect". Applicants respectfully submit that this amendment to Claim 20 has overcome the rejection under 35 USC 112, first paragraph.

With respect to numbered paragraphs 12 and 13, Applicants have cancelled Claims 8 and 9 without prejudice or disclaimer. Applicants respectfully submit that this amendment has rendered moot the rejections set forth in numbered paragraphs 12 and 13.

Rejections under 35 USC 112, second paragraph

In numbered paragraph 15 of the present Office Action, the Examiner states that Claims 1-2, 4-7, and 14 have been rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention.

The Examiner states that the limitation of "distribution resources" is

Appl. No. 09/221,952

described in the specification as being internal or external, and that the Claims do not make it distinct as to which is being claimed. Applicant respectfully submits that independent Claim 1 is directed to an information apparatus, such as for example, the information apparatus 200 illustrated in Fig. 2. It seems clear from Fig. 2 that the distribution resource 206 is part of information apparatus 200, and that it is coupled to association resource 206, and that it comprises staging facility 230. Fig. 3, and its description at page 28 of the specification, indicate that the information apparatus comprises distribution resources 328 which includes, for example, docking connection 316. Applicant respectfully submits that the claimed distribution resources are an integral part of the claimed information apparatus. Claim 1 has been amended to make clear that the "distribution resources" referred to therein, are "internal to the information apparatus". Applicant submits that this amendment overcomes all the rejections based upon the alleged indefiniteness of the "distribution resources".

With respect to the rejection of Claim 1, based on the allegation that the term "indirect distribution" is a relative term that renders the claim indefinite, Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection and requests that it be withdrawn. Applicant respectfully submits that the specification makes clear the difference in meaning between direct and indirect distribution, such that any one of ordinary skill in the art would be apprised of the scope of the invention. The Examiner's attention is directed to page 17, lines 13-28 of the specification, wherein the distinction between direct and indirect distribution is explained. More particularly, the specification makes clear that although the distribution resources may provide acquired data to exploiting resources, there are instances wherein the acquired data is further processed and then set aside for a later distribution process. By way of example, and not limitation, if the information apparatus acquires data that is to be distributed to a remote host which is not connected to the information apparatus, the acquired information may be stored by the staging facility which supports delayed distribution (i.e., distribution when the host is connected to the information apparatus at a later time). Alternatively, the acquired information may be destined for processing by an application program

Appl. No. 09/221,952

(i.e., an exploiting resource) in the remote host such that the data is incorporated into a database within the host, but with the host not connected to the information apparatus, the acquired data is incorporated into a local (i.e., within the information apparatus) copy of the database by an exploiting resource within the information apparatus, along with the posting of associated status and annotation information. Subsequently, when the information apparatus is connected to the remote host, a synchronization process may be performed, by which the earlier acquired and locally processed data is communicated to the now connected remote host. Such processes, as are described above, are referred to by the Applicants as indirect distributions of data to exploiting resources. In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that the use of the expression "indirect distribution" does not render Claim 1 indefinite.

With respect to Claim 20, the Examiner states that both the terms "direct" and "indirect" render the Claim indefinite. By this amendment, both these terms have been deleted. Applicant respectfully submits that this amendment to Claim 20 has overcome the rejection under 35 USC 112, second paragraph.

With respect to Claim 4, the Examiner states that there is insufficient antecedent basis for the limitation "the annotation". Claim 4 has been amended in a non-narrowing manner to correct the lack of antecedent basis. Applicant respectfully submits that this amendment to Claim 6 has overcome the rejection under 35 USC 112, second paragraph.

With respect to Claim 6, the Examiner states that there is insufficient antecedent basis for the limitation "the association". Claim 6 has been amended in a non-narrowing manner to correct the lack of antecedent basis. Applicant respectfully submits that this amendment to Claim 6 has overcome the rejection under 35 USC 112, second paragraph.

Rejections under 35 USC 102(e)

Claims 1-10, 12, and 14-21 have been rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as

Appl. No. 09/221,952

being anticipated by Clark, et al., (US Patent 6,317,797).

Independent Claim 1 has been amended to recite that the acquisition resources comprise a plurality of transducing facilities and selected ones of the plurality of transducing facilities are grouped together for activation responsive to actuation of one acquisition control facility. Support for this amendment can be found in the specification at page 14, lines 19-26. There is no such disclosure in Clark, et al., nor is there a suggestion or motivation for the invention defined by amended independent Claim 1.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections under 35 USC 102(e) of independent Claim 1, and the Claims that depend therefrom have been overcome.

Conclusion

All of the objections and rejections in the outstanding Office Action of 27 May 2004 have been responded to, and Applicants respectfully submit that the pending Claims 1-7, 10, 12, and 14-21 are now in condition for allowance.

Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

By Raymond J. Werner
Raymond J. Werner
Reg. No. 34,752

Dated: 27 August 2004
Portland, Oregon